

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Entry of the foregoing amendments is respectively requested. In an Office action mailed November 3, 2008, the Examiner has allowed claims 4-9 and 15, and rejected claims 19-24. In this response, claims 19-24 have been canceled. Thus, claims 4-9 and 15 are pending.

Specifically, the Examiner has 1) objected to the disclosure for various informalities in paragraphs [0005] and [0016], 2) objected to the amendment filed September 2, 2008 under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) for introducing new matter into the disclosure, and 3) rejected claims 19-24 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

#### **Objection to the disclosure for informalities in paragraphs [0005] and [0016]**

The Examiner has objected to the disclosure for informalities in paragraph [0005] and [0016], specifically, for missing conjunctions between the elements "Pb" and "Cd," and between "Co" and "Mn." Additionally, the "+" sign should have been superscripted to show a valence of 4, as in "4<sup>+</sup>," and conjunctions were missing between "4<sup>+</sup>" and "3<sup>+</sup>" in the definition of B.

The corrections required by the Examiner have been made.

#### **Objection to the amendment filed September 2, 2008, under 35 U.S.C. 132(a)**

The Examiner has objected to the amendment filed September 2, 2008 under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it introduced new matter into the disclosure. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that it is unclear from the disclosure as originally filed if "x is [in] a range from 0 to 0.15" means  $0 < x < 0.15$  or  $0 \leq x \leq 0.15$ . The Examiner further asserts that the teachings in the disclosure did not indicate that the inventor(s) had at the

time the application was filed possession of  $0 \leq x \leq 0.15$ , and thus this range was considered new matter.

Paragraph [0005.1] has been amended to read that in one embodiment the index "x" ranges from greater than 0 to less than 0.15. Thus, it is believed that the objection to the amendment filed 2 September, 2008 under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) has been overcome.

Rejection of claims 19-24 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph

The Examiner has rejected claims 19-24 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Specifically, the Examiner asserts that the claimed x range is not supported by the disclosure as originally filed if it means it is unclear from the disclosure as originally filed if "x is [in] a range from 0 to 0.15" means  $0 \leq x \leq 0.15$ . The originally filed disclosure is  $0 < x < 0.15$ , but the newly claimed range is  $0 \leq x \leq 0.15$ . The Examiner further asserts the specification teaches only those calcium and barium titanates, hafnates or zirconates containing 5 mol% Fe substituted for Ba or Ca will have the claimed properties, and that the originally filed disclosure does not teach that all the compositions that fall within the formulas of claims 19-24 will have the claimed properties.

Claims 19-24 have been canceled.

### CONCLUSION

Entry of the foregoing amendment is respectfully requested. Claims 4-9 and 15 have been previously amended. Claims 19-24 have been cancelled. Thus, claims 4-9 and 15 are pending.

An issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone conference would advance the prosecution of the present application, she is invited to call the undersigned attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: May 4, 2009

By: /Martin C. Fliesler/  
Martin C. Fliesler  
Registration No. 25,656

Fliesler Meyer LLP  
650 California Street, 14<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94108  
(415) 362-3800  
Customer No. 23910